

Concepts of Social Destruction Philosophical Analysis

G. Bekmurodova

Candidate of Philosophy, Associate Professor (Kar SU)

Abstract: The article states that by the beginning of the new century, human society has entered a qualitatively new stage of its development. The social problems and negative processes that arise at this stage cause serious concern about their complexity and the scale of the consequences. In this regard, there is a need to generalize reflections on the essence and causes of destructive situations in order to determine the patterns of these processes. The article asserts that religious and philosophical views on the essence of destructive processes in the being of nature, society and man, the theoretical conclusions of G.V.F.Hegel, F.Nietzsche, Z.Freud, M. Horkheimer, T. Adorno, G. Marcuse and E. Fromm can serve as a reliable theoretical and methodological basis for a systematic analysis of today's regressive and crisis processes and factors, negative and destructive phenomena.

Keywords: destruction, social destruction, interpretation of destructive processes in Zoroastrianism, interpretation of destructive processes in Christianity, interpretation of destructive processes in Islam.

Concepts of social destruction began to take shape in the second half of the last century. However, this does not mean that these concepts came into being on their own, apart from the logic of theoretical considerations for the development of society. Throughout the history of mankind, while witnessing various destructive situations, he deeply felt that these situations have a certain logic and legitimacy. These feelings and imaginations have previously been expressed in various myths, fairy tales, exhortations, and proverbs. That is why such proverbs as "Someone fixes - someone corrupts", "Evil has good", "Fire and water do not agree", "Oppression unites the oppressed". Gradually, the destructive conditions in nature and society, the processes leading to degradation, the practical experiences of the tendency of some people to destruction have become conclusions with a certain system.

The earliest ideas about destructive states in nature, society, and human existence can be found in religious sources. In Zoroastrianism, for example, the development of the world is generally conceived as the pursuit of goodness and goodness: it is clear that someday the absolute sovereignty of the god of goodness, Ahuramazda, will be ensured, and goodness and justice will prevail. But as soon as the first forms of oppression (peaceful life, creation, beautification, etc.) appeared, the opposite forms of evil (drought, sacrifices, wars, diseases, etc.) also appeared in opposition to it. Zoroastrianism has an author of all destructive states - this inspiring force is associated with the image of Ahriman. Ahriman is the source and inspiration of all evil forces: he sometimes turns people into slaves of evil (as he put Zahhok on the throne), and sometimes misleads them from the right path (as he beat Jamshid).

In Christianity, destructive states are conceived not as independent substances, but as disturbances of various processes. God created matter, shaped it into various forms, and filled it with various properties. All his creative endeavors are interspersed with goodness, and, indeed, the very being he created is also goodness. However, there are situations and processes that

erode and destroy this goodness. It is precisely these situations and processes that should be interpreted as evil. Evil is not an independent reality created from the beginning, it is the destruction of things created by God. For example, God created man as a free being in His own image, and made him acquainted with good works. But the son of man fell into sin and turned away from God, turning to evil. From that moment on, according to the Christian interpretation, all his actions became destructive.

In Islam, evil is interpreted more in terms of human negative behavior. According to Islamic teachings, the purpose of human life is to attain spiritual heights by believing in God, knowing Him, loving Him, and praying. Any source that keeps a human being steadfast in this path is good, and any misleading state is evil. It is difficult to know the nature of evil, and only God can do it. That is why Surat al-Baqara says: Perhaps what you dislike is good for yourselves, and what you like is bad for you. God knows, and you do not know. Apparently, in the Islamic interpretation, the unpleasantness that leads a person to know Allah (for example, illness - if a person overcomes it with patience) serves good, and the condition that appears to be good (for example, wealth - if it leads a person to sin) serves evil.

There are also many philosophical teachings that seek to explain the causes and consequences of destructive situations. We will limit ourselves to translating some of them into language. One of the first attempts to describe the essence and logic of destructive situations from a philosophical position can be seen in daoism. Its foundations are embodied in Lao Tzu's Dao De Jing. The thinker explains that the dao is the universal unity of being, the law that ensures its integrity. Any attempt to oppose it will eventually lead to destruction and decline. Such an understanding of destruction is also found in the Advaita-Vedanta doctrine, a peculiar interpretation of Vedanta philosophy, one of the orthodox schools of Hinduism. According to him, only Brahman is real, and the whole world is nothing but a mirage. Brahman is a pure essence, and any process that contradicts it ends with degradation.

In revealing the ontological basis of destructive processes, the great German philosopher G.V.F. Hegel's services were great. While the philosopher conceives of evolution as the evolution of the soul, he emphasizes its ambivalent nature. The soul, by its very nature, is ambiguous: it embodies both positive and negative attributes. Because the soul has an am-bivalent nature, it gives birth to positive products on the one hand, and negative products on the other. Positiveness is important and negativity is temporary. Moreover, it is the temporality of negativity that ensures the stability of positivity. It is clear from Hegel's observations that the more destructive the processes in reality, the more necessary and destructive are the destructive processes. It is the unity and struggle of these opposites (destructiveness and constructiveness, creation and destruction, progress and regress) that ensure the integrity of the universe.

Unlike G. Hegel, the German philosopher F. Nietzsche focuses on the anthropological foundations of destructive regions. Nietzsche, like Hegel, does not use the concept of "destructiveness." However, his reflections are aimed at understanding and explaining the essence and logic of destructive processes. He associates destructiveness with savagery and interprets it as an important attribute of human life. Nietzsche's works reveal the objectivity, ambivalence, and expediency of savagery. In particular, in his work *On the Genealogy of Morality*, he emphasizes the savagery of savagery. "Life itself, in essence, is full of insults, violence, aggression and destruction, according to its basic functions," he writes. In describing the ambivalence (i.e., the dual nature) of savagery, the philosopher reveals the interdependence of creativity and destruction, one requiring the other, the origin of the other. The eternal pleasure of creativity includes the joy of destruction, "Nietzsche said. Finally, while the philosopher emphasizes that the development of the whole requires the decay of individual parts, he also proves that there are purposeful aspects of destruction.

Freud was able to reveal the psychological aspects of destructive processes. The scientist refers to the concepts of Eros and Thanatos to reveal the positive and negative aspects of human behavior. Eros is the basic instinct of human life. It calls man to continue, to preserve, to be

creative in his life. The source of such behavior is what the scientist calls libido. In contrast, Thanatos is a power that leads man to death. Freud calls the energy of Thanatos that leads to destruction, aggression, destruction. Human life is the process by which Eros resists Thanatos.

Thus, in the second half of the last century, the concepts of social destruction emerged as a logical continuation of theoretical considerations of destructive processes related to nature, society, and human existence. The main sources that contributed to its formation are:

- a) religious views on the nature of destructive processes in nature, society and human existence;
- b) ideas of various philosophical doctrines on the content and logic of destructive processes;
- c) G.V.F. Hegel's theoretical conclusions on the ontological basis of destructive processes;
- d) Nietzsche's theoretical conclusions on the anthropological basis of destructive processes;
- e) Z. Freud's theoretical conclusions on the psychological basis of destructive processes.

Some researchers who have conducted research on the subject have referred to this category of sources as M. Scheler's theory of emotional aspirations and the mutual resistance of the soul, H. Plesner's theory of positionality, A. Gelen's theory of the biological harm of man, K. Lo-rents' theory of innate aggression, N. Berdyaev's theory of mutual opposition of culture and civilization, P. Sorokin's concept of the exchange of types of civilization, O. Spengler's concept of cultural death, M. Bakhtin's idea of the carnival mechanism, Yu. Lotman's theory of cultural explosions, E. Durkheim's theory of anomie, H. Ortega-i-Gasset's concept of "mass human uprising", Z. They also introduce Bau-man's idea of non-equivalent exchange. However, we have not specifically studied their content, given that these theories and ideas are not directly but indirectly related to the concept of social destruction.

These sources provided a solid theoretical and methodological basis for the formation of a holistic concept of social destruction. This task was accomplished by prominent representatives of the Frankfurt School.

Representatives of the Frankfurt School do not apply such a concept to themselves. The name was later used by researchers to refer to a group of philosophers who created the Institute of Social Research in 1923 at the University of Frankfurt under the auspices of merchants German Weil and his son Felix Weil. Its original leader, Karl Grünberg, attracted a number of young philosophers to the institute who were prone to communist and social-democratic views. These scholars dealt with the most pressing problems of social philosophy, in particular the creation of a theory of modern industrial society. In 1931, the Institute was headed by the famous philosopher Max Horkheimer. Since that time, the institute's T. Adorno, G. Marcuse, E. Books by representatives such as Fromm and articles published in the journal "Journal of Social Research" have attracted the attention of the scientific community. The first versions of the concept of social destruction were also developed by these same thinkers.

The development of the concept of social destruction was prompted by the socio-political events that took place in Germany in the first half of the twentieth century. It is known that as a result of the defeat in the First World War, Germany lost its territory of 67 thousand km². On top of that, the country began paying multimillion-dollar reparations to Entente representatives. Despite the efforts of the government, Germany, cut off from world economic relations, came to the brink of economic crisis in the late 1920s. In 1932, about 68,000 industrial enterprises in the country went bankrupt, production fell by 40 percent and foreign trade by 60 percent. As a result of the decline in handicraft production and retail trade, the number of unemployed exceeded 8 million.

M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno's views on the causes of destructive states and regressive processes in society are completely different from those of Marxists. It is well known that Marxists look for the causes of contradictions in society in the peculiar features and laws of social production, in the constant class struggle. M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno doesn't think so.

According to them, man himself is an essentially destructive being. "Since its inception as a biological species, man," they write, "has evolved into the most evolutionary and, therefore, the most destructive force." This power is so powerful that if it destroys itself, it will destroy the whole of nature, the animal kingdom, and the plant world with it.

Thinkers see man's separation from nature as a turning point in human history. From that moment on, the subject (man) and the object (nature) came into being in nature, which was an integral system from the very beginning. Over the course of historical development, the subject's influence on the object has changed and become increasingly negative. Eventually man became accustomed to accepting nature as a reality capable of satisfying his own needs and whims. As a result, the entire human civilization began to develop in a destructive way. The destructive nature of development is so stable that the human child must first break something in order to build a system. It is impossible to build something new without breaking something. Thus, the thinkers say that destruction has acquired an objective and necessary character in human society.

M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno describes destructiveness as a specific form of human relation to the world. All forms of human effort are rooted in this approach. "This category of actions includes:

the discovery of the mysteries of the universe, that is, the intensification of formalization, the denial of everything and human uniqueness;

the renunciation of meaning, that is, the weakening of perceptions of its integrity as a result of changing and using the world;

the expulsion of spirituality from the material side as a counter-effect of nature: "nature takes revenge on man for turning him into an object of mastery, a raw material, by lowering him into a state of corpus";

madness in the form of a consumerist attitude to the world (in the sense of a sharp rationality here), a loss of the ability to create, a tendency to destroy everything that is not subject to obedience".

"The dialectic of enlightenment. The authors of the book "Philosophical Fragments" argue that social destruction in modern society leads to tragic consequences. As a result, as man becomes free from nature, he becomes more and more subject to society and social norms. Analysts who have analyzed the social processes of the mid-twentieth century in the context of their own concepts point out that social destruction has become a force that determines the goals of historical development. It is social destruction that forces people to abandon the way of life, traditions, customs and norms that have prevailed for centuries.

Thus, for the first time in social philosophy, Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno systematically (unlike other teachings and philosophers) systematically analyzed that destructiveness is an integral attribute of human nature, and that this attribute has a serious impact on the development of human society. The set of theoretical views of the authors, brought to the state of a holistic concept, for the first time allowed to imagine the negative and regressive processes in society as a whole, rather than separately, to think about the laws of social destruction. Therefore, their concept can be included in the category of the most important socio-philosophical doctrines of the twentieth century.

"The Dialectic of Enlightenment. Nine years after the publication of his book, *Philosophical Fragments*, the first version of the concept of social destruction, developed by Gerbert Marcuse, was submitted to the scientific community. For example, he worked as an expert in the special services during the Second World War and the first years after that, and was able to get acquainted with a number of analytical materials on the subject, and then worked as a political theorist at Columbia and Harvard universities. In 1956 he published "Eros and Civilization. Philosophical Research of Freud's Doctrine. In this book, Marcuse embodies part of the concept of social de-structuring. Then, in 1964, the philosopher presented his famous book, *The One-*

Dimensional Man: A Study of the Ideology of a Developed Industrial Society. The book completes the system of the thinker's views on the concept of social destruction.

As soon as Herbert Marcuse became acquainted with the concept, one could witness that he was deeply impressed by the teachings of Sigmund Freud. The philosopher in his "Eros and Civilization. Philosophical Study of Freud's Doctrine" states that the existence of man and society, like Freud, also has two origins - Eros and Thanatos. Eros resists Thanatos, creating a culture as he struggles with it. On a broader scale, the whole of human civilization is itself a product of Eros. Thanatos, on the other hand, exists as the antipode of Eros. Its destructive power not only serves to destroy, but also serves as a source of creativity and ingenuity.

According to Marcuse, Thanatos has two main characteristics - social destruction. First, it has a universal character. Nature, society, human existence itself has a destructive beginning. "Suffering, violence, and destruction are categories inherent in both natural and human reality," he wrote in his book, *One-Sided Man: A Study of the Ideology of a Developed Industrial Society*. Second, social destruction has an objective, axiologically neutral character. Human civilization itself triggers destructive processes, sometimes turning good into evil and sometimes evil into good.

In his second book, Herbert Marcuse focuses on depicting the emergence and occurrence of socio-destructive processes in human society. To do this, it first divides the history of human society into three periods: a) pre-industrial society; b) industrial society; c) postindustrial society. According to the philosopher, de-destructive processes also existed in pre-industrial society. However, during this period there was a certain difference between destruction and production efficiency. In an industrial society, however, there is no difference between destruction and production efficiency. Moreover, the efficiency of production itself was driven by destruction and ended in destruction. An industrial society (or a one-dimensional society) first creates the excessive and irrational needs of man, the mood of consumption, and then ensures human well-being by satisfying them. Prosperity, on the other hand, creates new and new irrational needs. Thus, the increase in production efficiency leads to the acceleration of destructive processes. In an industrial society, this cycle cannot be disrupted because it (the link between production efficiency and destruction) is maintained through additional repression. In this case, the thinker refers to additional repression as a mechanism of social restrictions and control that prevails in society.

Nevertheless, Herbert Marcuse concludes his remarks in a hopeful mood. He hopes that de-structuring processes will be brought to an acceptable level in a post-industrial society. The philosopher concludes his book with the words of Walter Benjamin, one of the greatest exponents of the philosophy of culture of the twentieth century:

The German philosopher and sociologist, psychologist and psychoanalyst Erich Fromm continued the traditional views of the Frankfurt School on the concept of social destruction. The thinker worked as a psychoanalyst for 35 years and compiled a wealth of material on human nature. During these materials he prepared an anthropological and socio-psychological monograph "Anatomy of Human Destructiveness" in 1967-1973. E. Fromm describes destruction as follows: "I divide the specific human tendency to absolute domination over other living beings, the desire to destroy, into a separate group and call it" destructiveness "and" savagery. " The philosopher, like other representatives of the Frankfurt school, sees social destruction as an integral feature of human society, but emphasizes that this characteristic has emerged throughout historical development.

But there are also sparks of hope in Erich Fromm's comments. The thinker considers the love of life to be one of the most important qualities of a biological being called man. It is the love of life that he believes will serve to neutralize the destructive states of modern society.

Thus, a number of representatives of the Frankfurt School, based on centuries of theoretical considerations on the subject, created different variants of the concepts of social destruction. The

common denominator of the concepts of Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and Erich Fromm is that they all interpret social destruction as a distinctive attribute of human society. However, while philosophical considerations by M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno led to conclusions that were mixed with a depressed mood, G. Marcuse and E. Fromm hopes that there are opportunities to neutralize the socio-destructive situation or at least reduce its impact.

It is true that the processes and events that took place in the last quarter of the twentieth century and the beginning of the new century, the trends in postindustrial society, do not yet justify some of the hopeful conclusions of Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm. However, over the last half century, a number of researchers in the field of social philosophy have refined the concept of social destruction created by these thinkers. has become a reliable theoretical and methodological basis for the systematic analysis of cases of negativity and destruction.

Conclusion. In conclusion, in the second half of the twentieth century, religious and philosophical views on the nature of destructive processes in nature, society and human existence, G.V.F. Hegel on the ontological basis of destructive processes, F. Nietzsche on the anthropological basis of destructive processes, Z. Freud Concepts of social destruction were created on the basis of theoretical conclusions on the psychological basis of destructive processes. Developed first by Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno, then by Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm, these concepts remain a reliable theoretical and methodological basis for a systematic analysis of today's regression and degradation processes and factors, negativity and destruction.

References:

1. Қаранг: Махмудов Т. “Авесто” ҳақида.- Т.:Шарқ, 2000.
2. Қаранг: Фирдавсий А. Шохнома.- Т.:А.Навоий номли Ўзб. Миллий кутубх.нашр., 2012.
3. Қаранг: Августин А. О свободе воли. Книга 2.// Антология средневековой мысли. В двух томах. Том 1.- СПб.: РХГИ, 2001.- С. 19-112.
4. Куръони Карим. Бақара сураси. 216-оят.// Куръони Каримнинг машхур суралари фазилати./ Нашрга тайёрловчилар А.Аҳмад, И.Нуруллоҳ.- Т.: Ғ.Ғулом номидаги нашр., 2021.- Б.119.
5. Қаранг: Благие дела: добро и зло в исламе.// <https://www.islam-love.ru>.
6. Қаранг: Торчинов Е.А. Даосизм. “Дао-де цзин”.- СПб.: Азбука классика, 2004.
7. Қаранг: Бурмистров С. Л. Брахман и история: Историко-философские концепции современной веданты. СПб., 2007.
8. Қаранг: Гегель Г.В.Ф. Феноменология духа.- М.:Наука, 2000.
9. Ницше Ф. К генеалогии морали.// Сочинения в двух томах.- М.:Мысль, 1990.- С.410.
10. Ницше Ф. Сумерки идолов, или как философствуют молотом. Сочинения в двух томах.- М.:Мысль, 1990.- С.629.
11. Ницше Ф. К генеалогии морали.// Сочинения в двух томах.- М.:Мысль, 1990.- С.455.
12. Фрейд З. Недовольство культурой.- М.:Фолио, 2013.
13. Борисова Г.А. Концепция социальной деструкции Франкфуртской школы (историко-философский анализ): Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос.н.- Екатеринбург: Уральское отд. ИФиП РАН, 2007.- С.4.
14. Қаранг: Муравьева Л.А. Германия в 30-е годы XX века.// Финансы и кредит, 2003, №17.- 82-с.